

REMARKS

Claim 27 is pending in the above-identified application. Claim 27 was rejected. Claims 1-26 were previously cancelled. (See, July 25, 2003 Preliminary Amendment).

With this Amendment, claim 27 is amended. Accordingly, claim 27 is at issue.

I. Amendment To Specification

The Examiner required an amendment to the specification to include the patent number of the patent which issued from the parent application. This has been done.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Kuroda et al.* (US 6,468,740)(“*Kuroda*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claim 27 recites:

“a horizontal scanning circuit element operatively connected to said reset element and said select switch and effective to generate and deliver said reset pulse and said select pulse”

This is clearly unlike *Kuroda*, which fails to disclose a horizontal scanning circuit element operatively connected to a reset element and a select switch and effective to generate and deliver a reset pulse and a select pulse. Instead, *Kuroda* discloses a vertical shift register unit which controls an external select pulse and an external reset pulse via a selected row driving transistor and a selected row reset driving transistor operatively connected to a reset element and a select switch. (See, *Kuroda* Col 7, lines 47-62). Further, nowhere does *Kuroda* disclose or even suggest a horizontal scanning circuit element operatively connected to a reset element and a select switch and effective to generate and deliver a reset pulse and a select pulse.

As the current application teaches, by providing a horizontal scanning circuit element operatively connected to a reset element and a select switch and effective to generate and deliver a reset pulse and a select pulse, the scanning circuit configuration can be simplified while the amount of noise is reduced. (See, U.S. Pub. No. 2005-0088548 Para. [0070]). Accordingly, the imaging sensor disclose in *Kuroda* is incapable of producing the imaging sensor claimed.

Therefore, because *Kuroda* fails to disclose or even fairly suggest all of the features of the claim 27, the rejection is improper.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 4, 2007

By: /David R. Metzger/

David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000